



Re: 15-CV-6581 docket entry #26

Carl Maat El

to:

Mann_Chambers

02/23/2016 01:14 PM

Hide Details

From: Carl Maat El <[REDACTED]>

To: Mann_Chambers([REDACTED])

Your honor, based on the out come of (Discover)

Consistent with plaintiffs statements, Pending the results of Discover, ask the Court to Consider, Pusuant to Federal Rule and Civil Procedure, 56 (a) (d) based on the Evidence of Discovery, and other violations of Plaintiff Constitutional Rights,

With Regard to Illegal Search and Seizure, Failure to Abide by Departmental Procedure, Violation of Plaintiff First amendment, Excessive force, Violation of Plaintiffs Civil Liberties

On Feb 23, 2016 12:09 PM, [REDACTED] wrote:

Pending judges orders, plaintiff will move to Amend the Case, CV6581

On Feb 23, 2016 12:04 PM, [REDACTED] wrote:

Plaintiff recieved the District Attorneys, Certificate of Deposition, While still detained, before he was arraignment

On Feb 23, 2016 12:00 PM, [REDACTED] wrote:

Please be Aware your honor, that plaintiffs dispute under 25:11, Arts and Cultural Affairs Statue, a Violation, Not a crime,
(that plaintiff should not have been arrested, (Under the Circumstances) And defendants, did not abide by Departmental Procedure, in Confiscating plaintiff's property, without proper documentation) plaintiff has Four Simular arrest pending by the Same defendant (s) Plaintiff still makes claim, for August 2015 dispute, violation of his constitutional and Civil liberties: Other pending matters by defendant: Dockets:

(2015QN024823: (2015) See details, about this Arrest, On Roosevelt Ave, in (Dated January 29 th 2016) Police got out of his Vehicle, Blocks away from venue, on Roosevelt Ave, After an accomplis stopped Plaintiff, While Biking in Flusing Meadow Park, (CALLED ARRESTING WHILE HE WAS AT HOME) Defedant Arrested Plaintiff that evening, when defendant got on dury
Notice Dated January, 29th, 2015)

2014QN058933: (2014)

2015QN045176: (2015)

2015QN041526: (2015)

On Feb 23, 2016 11:04 AM, [REDACTED] wrote:

Plaintiff, Dear Judge, please be advised, that there was a (MISINTERPRETATION on the part of Plaintiff's Attorney in criminal court)

And a (MISUNDERSTANDING BY PLAINTIFF) WHO Thought the Matter in Dispute was Dismissed, but it wasn't dismissed

Speaking specifically about the matter Under Docket # 2015QN054259, (Plaintiff was Incarcerated at the time, and the lawyer didnt Explain Clearly)

According to the Queens Court, this case is Still open your honor: Next Court date is March 7th, 2016:

When plaintiff retrieved the (Certificates of Deposition) UNDER THE IMPRESSION, That the case was Dismissed and Sealed, Based on the (District Attorneys Notice)

The District Attorneys Notice of a Dismissed case, was actually for another Docket Thinking this was the Method to Give Authorization to defendant,

Plaintiff Informed the Clerk of the court, of Federal Judges Order to Unseal the Case, (What plaintiff didnt Realize, is another case on the Docket was dismissed)

Please take Notice your honor, When plaintiff sent the District court, The Certificate of Dismissal, that was pertaining to Another docket, Which was tried with this Case Dispute Plaintiff didnt realize he was being Arraigned on two cases, He thought it was just the Matter on October 31st 2015

(The arrest under Above Docket (MATTER, or INDISPUTE) is still Open,

Next court date is on March 7th, 2016) Plaintiff was issued a fine, BUT HE THOUGHT IT WAS FOR ANOTHER Docket, There were Two cases on, When plaintiff appeared before the judge on arraignment, while incarcerated,

Plaintiff thought the Matter indispute, (Was the one that was Dismissed,) during Incarceration, to pay a fine in the Matter in dispute,

(This was a Conflict of Interest with plaintiffs Attorney)

Plaintiff was Detained at the time, (THE ATTORNEY REPRESENTING PLAINTIFF 'During Incarceration' DIDNT EXPLAIN,)

With this Notice, there is no need for an Unsealing authorization your honor

On Feb 22, 2016 4:41 PM, <Mann Chambers. [REDACTED]> wrote:

Minute Order. for proceedings held before Chief Mag. Judge Roanne L. Mann: granting 23 Motion to Compel; Telephone Conference held on 2/22/2016. For the reasons stated on the record, the Court grants in part defendants motion to compel and for an extension of time to respond to the complaint. Plaintiff will be given until March 21, 2016 to amend his complaint. Defendants' response to the operative pleading is due by April 11, 2016 or 21 days after the filing of plaintiff's amended complaint, whichever occurs first. Defendants will revise the section 160.50 unsealing authorization to utilize plaintiff's legal name and will transmit it to plaintiff today. Plaintiff is directed to execute the authorization before a notary and return it to defense counsel this week (see attached Minute Entry).